



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sake. Furthermore, though it will be useful to students, the book leaves much to be desired in scholarly thoroughness and accuracy, and also, occasionally, in good taste. Having approached with the most favorable expectations the unsought task of judging it, the reviewer confesses that he has been in turn gratified, surprised, and irritated to a degree that makes the task complex and far from easy.

KENNETH MCKENZIE.

Yale University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Der Traum, ein Leben, dramatisches Märchen in vier Aufzügen von FRANZ GRILLPARZER, edited by EDWARD STOCKTON MEYER, Western Reserve University; Boston, Heath & Co., 1902.

It would be interesting to trace out the distribution over the field of German literature of the multitude of annotated texts that have appeared in America since the study of the modern languages began to vie with that of the classics. Such an investigation would show a strange jumble of works, big and little, of apparently haphazard selection, aside from the inevitable group Lessing-Goethe-Schiller. To anyone who looked at the list from the systematic point of view, as a literary historian, it would appear equally puzzling for its strange sins of omission and for its astonishing sins of commission. Under the former head, the long neglect of Grillparzer would be one of the most surprising phenomena. But the day of Grillparzer as a school classic has come at last. In 1899, Professor Ferrell presented his edition of *Sappho*; now Professor Meyer gives us *Der Traum, ein Leben*; and there are rumors of more than one imminent edition of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*, which, perhaps, deserved the first place instead of the third.

The edition of *Der Traum, ein Leben* has many excellent qualities that are none too common, and the combination of which is quite rare. It shows an intimate acquaintance with the personality and the works of the author, and familiarity with the literature on the subject. It reveals literary sense, and warm sympathy with the work studied and with its author. It is intelligent, and quite free

from prolixity and overediting. The adverse criticisms that may be suggested are due largely to the fact that this edition has the defects of its qualities.

The brief Introduction, covering only 33 pages, gives a rapid review of Grillparzer's life, work, and character, and studies the play itself, mainly from the point of view of dynamic criticism, with particular reference to autobiographical and literary influences. The sources are given quite fully, with some new material—new, at least, to the reviewer; this part of the study is so detailed that it does not appear why a few minor sources are left unnoticed, for example, some of those that Professor R. M. Meyer mentions in his interesting article in the *Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, v, 430 f.

The brevity of the Introduction is a virtue; but in some instances it involves a conciseness that, considering the readers for whom the book is intended, amounts to obscurity. The student will be puzzled to know why Grillparzer compared Schreyvogel to Lessing (p. viii), and what it means to write an autobiography "in accordance with the statutes of the Academy of Science" (p. xv). The comparison of *Sappho* with *Tasso*, and of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* with *Iphigenie*, calls for explanation (p. xvii), and it should be stated where Sudermann's *Salome* is to be found. Here, too, some space could profitably be given to the history of plays of the Raimund type on the Viennese stage, and also of the opera, which is so important a source of certain elements in *Der Traum, ein Leben*. On p. xxi, the phrase "artist *par excellence*" should be carefully explained; as it stands, it is quite misleading, if it suggests anything at all definite to the student; so, too, with the "broad rhetoric" of Calderon and Schiller and the "exquisite art" of Lope and Goethe, and the "unique style" of Grillparzer (p. xxii). In this connection, a few details may be referred to that appear inexact or misleading. The antithesis of the "broad German farcical comedy" and the "fine French comedy" (p. xiv) is hardly fair. Corneille is certainly not a good example of the "predominance of the love element" (p. xvii), and if Schiller's "lines" were narrower than Grillparzer's (p. xviii—it should be explained how), the impression ought not to be given that Schiller did not care for "ideal eternal types and

the inner world." It is hardly correct to say that Goethe reached "the self-same solution" as Grillparzer (p. xx); their conceptions of "resignation" were of course vitally different. The characterization of the dramatis personæ (p. xxxi f.) is so brief that it does not differentiate clearly enough between the characters as they are primarily conceived by the poet and as they become in the fancy of the dreaming hero, and yet this transformation is one of the subtlest and most successful artistic effects of the play, to which the student should have his attention called quite explicitly. It might be noted here (p. xxxii) that old Caleb's name as well as his personality is reminiscient; it is the name of the hunter whom Mirza sees returning home in the first scene.

At the end of the Introduction, there is a somewhat confusing interblending of technical analysis and interpretation. This part has suffered most from the editor's self-limitation. It is hardly fair, perhaps, to demand a complete critical analysis in the introduction to a school edition, and such an analysis might even, in certain respects, be unpedagogical. But the question of style once being introduced, the subject should perhaps have been treated with some fulness—with reference, for example, to the diction, the lyric and descriptive elements, the comparative lack of dramatic shading, and the general qualities of style; an interesting detail—especially in comparison with Goethe's *Faust*—is the lack of humor. Then there are other technical questions about as important as that of the dramatic structure (in which connection *anti-climax* as a technical term is unfamiliar to the reviewer). The metrical and rhythmical quality of the work might well have been analyzed, for in this respect Grillparzer's art is peculiarly capricious and uncertain. The rhyme, with its curious distribution, often apparently accidental or negligent, is especially interesting; about forty per cent of all the lines are rhymed, and it would be interesting to compare the number and distribution of these lines with the rhymes of the *Ahnfrau*, and to contrast with them the dramas in pentameters. So far as the structure of the drama is concerned, a reference to the romantic device of the play within the play, particularly to Tieck's use of it, would be in order; the dream play is a specialized form of this device.

The sympathetic enthusiasm of the editor is another virtue that tends somewhat to excess, in a certain quality of exaggeration that pervades some of the critical judgments. Thus *Der arme Spielmann* is called "a remarkable story," and "one of the most pathetic in the world's literature," and again "one of the most perfect and pathetic tales in all literature." It is a good deal to say that "there is no more exquisite art in all dramatic literature" than that of *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*, and at least it should be noted that the most exquisite art of this drama is rather lyric than dramatic. It would be pertinent, by the way, in connection with this love tragedy, to note the pallor of the love element in *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Again, the figure of the heroine in *Die Jüdin von Toledo* is called "perfect of its kind," *Libussa* "a wonderful play," with "superb symbolism," and Mirza is designated as "wonderful." So, in the note to l. 1857, the scene of the two wine-cups receives excessive praise as "a wonderful presentation of the awful delirium of a fearful dream." It may seem pedantic to touch upon this point at all, as it is largely a matter of temperament; but a pedagogical principle is involved, for quite apart from the bias of such expressions, they are usually so general that they tend to confuse rather than to clarify the student's critical perception.

The Notes also give evidence of the editor's self-restraint, limited as they are in general to the absolutely essential. Here again the lines are perhaps drawn a little too closely, but it is certainly far better to err on this side than to follow the convenient dictionary and interlinear method. The subtle art of the double action is well elucidated in succinct explanatory notes. The real difficulties of the text are cleared up quite sufficiently, in the main; but there remain a few constructions puzzling to the student that might be explained, as l. 310, 695 f., 1076 f., 1252 f., 1670, 2248 f., 2420 f. The following remarks and emendations suggest themselves: l. 93, *foreshadows* is preferable to *presages* as a technical term, and l. 242, *figure* better than *picture*.—l. 262 is a direct quotation from Psalms xxxvii, 3.—l. 275, *Heldenbrauch* would better be translated "the way of heroes."—l. 283 f. seems like a distinct reminiscence of Goethe's *Faust*.—l. 361, *da drin* might be interpreted.—l. 438, the elusive *eins* would be better

rendered by an interrogatory form, as "Who will explain?"—l. 1169, *of* rather than *from*.—l. 1447, the *halbverschossenen Knochen* certainly refer to Rustan's own bones, if he gained his preferment by honest promotion from the ranks and ended his life as a shattered *invalid*.—l. 1817*, whose conscience stings? Certainly not that of the murdered man whom the adder is biting.—l. 1842 f., reminiscence of Voss' familiar poem *Die Spinnerin: Bald schnurrt das Rädchen, Bald läuft das Fädchen*. Is not this a Volkslied motif?—l. 2263 f., cf. ll. 1265, 1268.—l. 2289, it should be said, perhaps, that the motif of a mute breaking into speech is very old, at least as old as Herodotus. Other details in this scene seem to point directly to *Titus Andronicus*. The student will not gather, from the title *Die Stumme von Portici*, that Auber was a French composer.—l. 2399 is proverbial.—l. 2721, worship of the sun is not Islamic, but Zoroastrian.

The proof-reading of the volume is exceptionally good. Only one error was noted in the text itself:—l. 1884 should not be indented. Other misprints occur as follows: p. xxiii, *Commedia*; p. xxvi, *Melusina*, and l. 5 from below, *is told*; p. xxviii, *presentiment*, *Barmeciden*. In the Notes, to l. 31, *iezuo*; to l. 1169, should read 1168; to l. 2657, fill in page. The style is occasionally somewhat careless, and a book for students ought to be faultless in this matter; so p. xiii, *with whom he had no sympathy in Berlin*; also *to correspond* (and by the way, why should Goethe be called "the old seer?"); p. xix, *rise . . . to queen*; p. xxvii, *pawning to an Armenian the diamond*; p. xxviii, *trick to leave*; p. xxxii, *Old Kaleb is from the Derwisch*.

A good piece of work or an important drama has a right to be criticized closely; but let the last word of the critic be one of general appreciation of a piece of work that is well done.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

The Treatment of Nature in German Literature from Günther to the appearance of Goethe's Werther, by MAX BATT. Diss. Chicago, 1902.

The Treatment of Nature in the Works of Nikolaus Lenau, by CAMILLO VON KLENZE. Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, 1902. Vol. 7.

These two contributions to the rapidly growing literature on the treatment of nature by the poets and prose writers of different epochs evidently owe their inspiration to Alfred Biese's stimulating work: *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit* (1888) in which he gives a continuation of his treatment of the same subject among the Greeks and Romans.¹ In spite of the evident mastery of the subject and the brilliancy of the style, one feels at times the sketchiness of the treatment in Biese's work due to the attempt to cover so tremendous a field in the compass of one volume. There is ample room for detailed studies of individual writers or epochs to fill out the outlines given by Biese. It is evidently with this idea in mind that the monographs of Batt and von Klenze were written.

Unfortunately in the case of the former, the epoch chosen was too long to admit of being satisfactorily treated within the limits of a dissertation, and although the author probably started with the idea of making good the deficiencies which are especially apparent in the sections of Biese's book dealing with the first half of the eighteenth century, he has given us a treatment which is on the whole scarcely more detailed than that of Biese. This is especially true of the earlier poets Brockes and Haller, but also of Gessner, Cramer and Klopstock. The writers of the Anacreontic school and the poets of the Hainbund on the other hand receive a longer treatment, although one misses among the former the name of Cronegk and among the latter Boie, both of whom Biese mentions.

As Batt carefully avoids repeating the examples and the opinions of Biese, his dissertation deserves the credit of being considered an independent study and will form a useful supplement to the corresponding chapter in Biese. It has the advantage of greater clearness of arrangement, since each poet is treated of under a separate rubric. The question may, however, be properly asked, whether Batt would not have done better if he had

¹ *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls bei den Griechen und Römern*, Kiel, 1882.